

ACYLINDRICAL ACCESSIBILITY FOR GROUPS ACTING ON $\mathbb{R}$ -TREES

ILYA KAPOVICH AND RICHARD WEIDMANN

ABSTRACT. We prove an acylindrical accessibility theorem for finitely generated groups acting on $\mathbb{R}$ -trees. Namely, we show that if G is a freely indecomposable non-cyclic k -generated group acting minimally and D -acylindrically on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree X then there is a finite subtree $T_\varepsilon \subseteq X$ of measure at most $2D(k-1) + \varepsilon$ such that $GT_\varepsilon = X$. This generalizes theorems of Z. Sela and T. Delzant about actions on simplicial trees.

1. INTRODUCTION

An isometric action of a group G on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree X is said to be D -acylindrical (where $D \geq 0$) if for any $g \in G, g \neq 1$ we have $\text{diam Fix}(g) \leq D$, that is any segment fixed point-wise by g has length at most D . For example the action of an amalgamated free product $G = A *_C B$ on the corresponding Bass-Serre tree is 2-acylindrical if C is malnormal in A and 1-acylindrical if C is malnormal in both A and B . In fact the notion of acylindricity seems to have first appeared in this context in the work of Karras and Solitar [32], who termed it *being r -malnormal*.

Sela [37] proved an important acylindrical accessibility result for finitely generated groups which, when applied to one-ended groups, can be restated as follows: for any one-ended finitely generated group G and any $D \geq 0$ there is a constant $c(G, D) > 0$ such that for any minimal D -acylindrical action of G on a simplicial tree X the quotient graph X/G has at most $c(G, D)$ edges. This fact plays an important role in Sela's theory of JSJ-decompositions for word-hyperbolic groups [38] and thus in his solution of the isomorphism problem for torsion-free hyperbolic groups [36]. Moreover, acylindrical splittings feature prominently in relation to the Combination Theorem of Bestvina-Feighn [7, 9] and its various applications and generalizations [17, 23, 26, 33]. Unlike other kinds of accessibility results, such as Dunwoody accessibility [20, 21], Bestvina-Feighn generalized accessibility [5, 6] and strong accessibility (introduced by Bowditch [13] and proved by Delzant and Potyagailo [19]), acylindrical accessibility holds for finitely generated and not just finitely presented groups.

Date: February 1, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F67.

The first author was supported by the U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation grant BSF-1999298.

Delzant [18] obtained a relative version of Sela's theorem for finitely presented groups with respect to a family of subgroups. In particular, he showed that the constant $c(G, D)$ above can be chosen to be $12DT$, where T is the number of relations in any finite presentation of G where all relators have length three. Weidmann [40] used the theory of Nielsen methods for groups acting on simplicial trees to show that for any k -generated one-ended group one can choose $c(G, D) = 2D(k - 1)$. In the present paper we obtain an analogue of this last result for groups acting on $\mathbb{R}$ -trees.

Before formulating our main result let us recall the notion of Nielsen equivalence:

Definition 1.1 (Nielsen equivalence). Let G be a group and let $M = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$ be an n -tuple of elements of G . The following moves are called *elementary Nielsen moves* on M :

- (N1) For some $i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ replace g_i by g_i^{-1} in M .
- (N2) For some $i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq n$ replace g_i by $g_i g_j$ in M .
- (N3) For some $i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq n$ interchange g_i and g_j in M .

We say that $M = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$ and $M' = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \in G^n$ are *Nielsen-equivalent*, denoted $M \sim_N M'$, if there is a chain of elementary Nielsen moves which transforms M to M' .

It is easy to see that if $M \sim_N M'$ then M and M' generate the same subgroup of G . For this reason Nielsen equivalence is a very useful tool for studying the subgroup structure of various groups.

We prove the following statement which can be regarded as an “acylindrical accessibility” result for finitely generated groups acting on real trees. Indeed, our theorem says that there is a bound on the size of a “fundamental domain” for a minimal D -acylindrical isometric action of a k -generated group on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree:

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a freely indecomposable finitely generated group acting by isometries on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree X . Let $D \geq 0$. Suppose that $G \neq 1$ is not infinite cyclic, that the action of G is D -acylindrical, nontrivial (does not have a fixed point) and minimal (that is X has no proper G -invariant subtrees).*

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary real number. Then any finite generating k -tuple Y of G is Nielsen-equivalent to a k -tuple S such that:

- (1) *There is a finite subtree $T_\varepsilon \subseteq X$ of measure at most $2D(k - 1) + \varepsilon$ such that $GT_\varepsilon = X$;*
- (2) *for some $x \in T_\varepsilon$ we have*

$$\max\{d(x, sx) | s \in S\} \leq 2D(k - 1) + \varepsilon.$$

By the *measure* of T_ε we mean the sum of the lengths of intervals in any subdivision of T_ε as a disjoint union of finitely many intervals. This is equal to the 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure of Y . If X is a simplicial tree and

T_ε is a simplicial subtree, then the measure of T_ε is the number of edges in T_ε .

Theorem 1.2 immediately implies the following since actions with trivial arc stabilizers are 0-acylindrical:

Corollary 1.3. *Let G be a finitely generated freely indecomposable non-cyclic group which acts by isometries on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree X with trivial arc stabilizers. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any finite generating tuple Y of G there is a tuple S Nielsen-equivalent to Y and a point $x \in X$ such that $d(x, sx) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $s \in S$.*

Thus if the action of G is 0-acylindrical, that is arc stabilizers are trivial, then a finite generating set of G can be made by Nielsen transformations to have arbitrarily small translation length. Not surprisingly our methods let us recover the same bound $c(G, D) = 2D(k - 1)$ on the complexity of acylindrical accessibility splittings as the one given in [40]. The main ingredient is a theory of Nielsen methods for groups acting on hyperbolic spaces that we systematically developed in [29, 30]. This theory is analogous to Weidmann's treatment of actions on simplicial trees [40], but the case of arbitrary hyperbolic spaces is technically much more complicated. Note that the proof of Theorem 1.2 completely avoids the Rips machinery for groups acting on $\mathbb{R}$ -trees [8, 27] and Theorem 1.2 makes no traditional stability assumptions about the action. Rather, we use the fact that an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree is δ -hyperbolic for any $\delta > 0$, which allows us to make a limiting argument for δ tending to zero.

We thank the referee whose detailed and insightful comments have helped to greatly improve this paper.

2. THE MAIN TECHNICAL TOOL

Our main tool is a technical result (see Theorem 2.4 below) obtained by Kapovich and Weidmann in [30]. It is motivated by the Kurosh subgroup theorem (see [34, 3]) for free products, which states that a subgroup of a free product $*_{i \in I} A_i$ is itself a free product of a free group and subgroups that are conjugate to subgroups of the factors A_i .

Definition 2.1. Suppose that (X, d) is an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree and that U is a finitely generated group that acts on X by isometries. Put $E(U) := \{x \in X \mid ux = x \text{ for some } u \in U - 1\}$. If U does not fix a point of X , let X_U be the minimal U -invariant subtree of X . If U fixes a point of X , let X_U denote the set of all points of X fixed by U .

Finally, put $X(U)$ to be the smallest U -invariant subtree containing $X_U \cup E(U)$. Thus $X(U)$ is a nonempty U -invariant subtree of X .

We generalize the notion of Nielsen equivalence as follows. The objects which correspond to the tuples of elements of G are the G -tuples:

Definition 2.2 (G -tuple). Let G be a group.

Let $n \geq 0$, $m \geq 0$ be integers such that $m + n > 0$. We will say that a tuple $M = (U_1, \dots, U_n; H)$ is a G -tuple if U_i is a non-trivial subgroup of G for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $H = (h_1, \dots, h_m) \in G^m$ is an m -tuple of elements of G . We will denote $\overline{M} = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n \cup \{h_1, \dots, h_m\}$ and call $\overline{M}$ the *underlying set* of M . Note that $\overline{M}$ is nonempty since $m + n > 0$.

By analogy with the Kurosh subgroup theorem we will sometimes refer to the subgroups U_i as *elliptic components* of M . This is justified since in most applications of our methods, in particular the proof of Theorem 1.2, the subgroups U_i are generated by sets of elements with short translation length. We should stress, however, that U_i need not be fixing a point of a tree on which G acts. We will also refer to H as the *hyperbolic component* of M . We have the following notion of equivalence for G -tuples which generalizes the classical Nielsen equivalence.

Definition 2.3 (Equivalence of G -tuples). We will say that two G -tuples $M = (U_1, \dots, U_n; H)$ and $M' = (U'_1, \dots, U'_n; H')$ are *equivalent* if $H = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$ and $H' = (h'_1, \dots, h'_m)$ and M' can be obtained from M by a chain of moves of the following type:

- (1) For some $1 \leq j \leq n$ replace U_j by gU_jg^{-1} where
$$g \in \langle \{h_1, \dots, h_m\} \cup U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{j-1} \cup U_{j+1} \cup \dots \cup U_n \rangle.$$
- (2) For some $1 \leq i \leq n$ replace h_i by $h'_i = g_1h_ig_2$ where
$$g_1, g_2 \in \langle \{h_1, \dots, h_{i-1}, h_{i+1}, \dots, h_m\} \cup U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n \rangle.$$

Our main technical tool is Theorem 2.4 stated below. It is a corollary of Theorem 2.4 in [30] that deals with arbitrary group actions on δ -hyperbolic geodesic metric spaces.

Theorem 2.4 (Kapovich-Weidmann). [30] *Let G be a group acting on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree (X, d) by isometries.*

Let $M = (U_1, \dots, U_n; H)$ be a G -tuple where $H = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$ and let

$$U = \langle \overline{M} \rangle = \langle \{h_1, \dots, h_m\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i \rangle \leq G.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary positive number.

*Then either $U = U_1 * \dots * U_n * F(H)$ or there exists a G -tuple $M' = (U'_1, \dots, U'_n; H')$ with $H' = (h'_1, \dots, h'_m)$ such that M' is equivalent to M and at least one of the following holds:*

- (1) $d(X(U'_i), X(U'_j)) < \varepsilon$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.
- (2) $d(X(U'_i), h'_j X(U'_i)) < \varepsilon$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.
- (3) *There exists a point $x \in X$ such that $d(x, h_j x) < \varepsilon$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.*

Remark 2.5. The statement of Theorem 2.4 in [30] does not use the tree $X(U)$ defined above but, rather, the tree $X_\delta(U)$ (where $\delta \geq 0$) defined as follows.

Let

$$E_\delta(U) := \{x \in X : d(ux, u) \leq 100\delta \text{ for some } u \in U, u \neq 1.\}$$

Then the tree $X_\delta(U)$ is defined as $E_\delta(U)$ if U fixes a point and as the smallest U -invariant subtree of X containing X_U and $E_\delta(U)$ otherwise.

Note that $X(U) \subseteq X_\delta(U)$ by construction. Let $x \in E_\delta(U)$ and let $y \in X(U)$ be such that $d(x, y) = d(x, X(U))$. Let $u \in U, u \neq 1$ be such that $d(x, ux) \leq 100\delta$. Note that the choice of y guarantees that there exists no $z \in [x, y]$ with $y \neq z$ and $uz = z$ as otherwise $z \in X(U)$ and $d(x, z) < d(x, y)$. It follows that $d(x, ux) = 2d(x, y) + d(y, uy)$ and hence $d(x, y) \leq 50\delta$. Thus we have shown that $E_\delta(U)$ is contained in the 50δ -neighborhood of $X(U)$. This implies that, whether or not U fixes a point, for any $\delta \geq 0$ the trees $X(U)$ and $X_\delta(U)$ are 50δ -Hausdorff close.

Since an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree is δ -hyperbolic for any $\delta > 0$, Theorem 2.4 of [30] now directly implies Theorem 2.4 above by taking the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

We deploy Theorem 2.4 in the proof of Theorem 1.2 for a "generator transfer" process to analyze a freely indecomposable subgroup generated by a finite set $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ with k elements. First we start with a G -tuple $M_1 = (; H_Y)$ where $H_Y = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$. We then construct a sequence of G -tuples $M_1, M_2, \dots$ by repeatedly applying Theorem 2.4 in order to either "drag" elements of the "hyperbolic" components of G -tuples into their "elliptic" components or to join two elliptic components to form one new elliptic component. A simple observation shows that the length of the sequence $M_1, M_2, \dots$ is bounded by $2k - 1$. The desired result is then obtained by analyzing the terminal member of this sequence.

3. GROUPS ACTING ON REAL TREES

We define "generating trees" exactly as in [10].

Definition 3.1 (Generating tree). Let $U = \langle S \rangle$ be a group acting by isometries on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree X . We say that a tree $T_U \subset X$ is an *S -generating tree of U* if $Y \cap sY \neq \emptyset$ for all $s \in S$. We further say that T_U is a *generating tree of U* if T_U is an S -generating tree for U for some generating set S of U .

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the definitions; it also justifies the term "generating tree".

Lemma 3.2. *Let X be an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree and let $U = \langle S \rangle$ be a group acting on X by isometries. Let $T_U \subset X$ be an S -generating tree of U . Then the following hold:*

- (1) *The set UT_U is connected and U -invariant, and hence is a subtree of X .*
- (2) *If U does not fix a point of X , then UT_U contains the minimal U -invariant subtree X_U of X .*

We can now observe that for acylindrical actions the fix point set $E(U)$ cannot be too far from the minimal U -invariant tree X_U , i.e. that $X(U)$ and X_U are close. The following is a simple exercise.

Lemma 3.3. *Let U be a group acting by isometries on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree X and suppose this action is D -acylindrical for some $D \geq 0$. Then the following hold:.*

- (1) *Let $y \in X$ be such that $d(y, X_U) = R$. Then for any $u \in U, u \neq 1$ we have $d(y, uy) \geq 2R - 2D$.*
- (2) *The set $E(U)$ is contained in the D -neighborhood of X_U . Moreover, $X(U)$ and X_U are D -Hausdorff close.*
- (3) *If U fixes a point $x \in X$ then for any $y \in X(U)$ we have $d(x, y) \leq D$.*

Before we proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.2 let us recall some more notions from [30].

Definition 3.4 (Partitioned tuple). Let G be a group. If Y is an n -tuple of elements of G we will say that n is *the length of Y* which we denote by $L(Y)$. We will say that $M = (Y_1, \dots, Y_p; H)$ is a *partitioned tuple* in G if $p \geq 0$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_p, H$ are finite tuples of elements of G such that at least one of these tuples has positive length and such that for any $i \geq 1$ the tuple Y_i has positive length.

We will call the sum of the lengths of $L(Y_1) + \dots + L(Y_p) + L(H)$ *the length of M* and denote it by $L(M)$. We further call the $L(M)$ -tuple, obtained by concatenating the tuples $Y_1, \dots, Y_p, H$, *the tuple underlying M* .

Definition 3.5 (Complexity). Let $M = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n; H)$ be a partitioned tuple. As in [40, 30], we define the *complexity* of M to be the pair $(L(H), n)$. Thus the complexity is an element of $\mathbb{N}^2$ where $\mathbb{N} = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. We order $\mathbb{N}^2$ by setting $(m, n) \leq (m', n')$ if $m < m'$ or if $m = m'$ and $n \leq n'$. This gives a well-ordering on $\mathbb{N}^2$ and allows us to compare complexities.

Remark 3.6. To any partitioned tuple $M = (Y_1, \dots, Y_p; H)$ we associate the G -tuple $\tau = (U_1, \dots, U_p; H)$, where $U_i = \langle Y_i \rangle$. Suppose now that τ is equivalent to a G -tuple $\tau' = (U'_1, \dots, U'_p; H')$. The definition of equivalence of G -tuples implies that there is a partitioned tuple $M' = (Y'_1, \dots, Y'_p; H')$ with associated G -tuple τ' such that the tuples underlying M and M' are Nielsen-equivalent. Moreover, we can choose Y'_i to be conjugate to Y_i for each $1 \leq i \leq p$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2.

Recall that in Theorem 1.2 Y is a given k -tuple generating G . Clearly, it is enough to prove the statement of Theorem 1.2 under the assumption that Y is not Nielsen-equivalent to a tuple containing $1 \in G$. Thus we will assume that every k -tuple Nielsen-equivalent to Y consists of nontrivial elements.

Now in order to prove Theorem 1.2 it suffices to establish:

Claim. There exist a k -tuple S Nielsen-equivalent to Y and an S -generating tree T_ε of measure at most $2D(k-1) + \varepsilon$.

Let $N = (S_1, \dots, S_n; H)$ be a partitioned tuple of elements of G . Let $k_i = L(S_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We say that N is *good* if $U_i = \langle S_i \rangle \neq 1$ for all $i \geq 1$ and if for each $U_i, i \geq 1$ there exists an S_i -generating tree T_i of measure at most $2D(k_i - 1) + \frac{2k_i - 1}{2k} \varepsilon$.

We define N_1 to be the partitioned tuple $N_1 = (; Y)$. Clearly N_1 is good.

Choice of M . Let $M = (S_1, \dots, S_n; H)$ with $H = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$ be a partitioned tuple of minimal complexity among all partitioned good tuples with the underlying tuple being Nielsen equivalent to Y . The partitioned tuple N_1 satisfies the above qualifying constraints and hence such an M exists.

We will show that $M = (S_1; -)$. This would immediately imply the Claim.

Suppose that M is not of this type. Recall that G is freely indecomposable and not infinite cyclic. It follows from Theorem 2.4 and Remark 3.6 that there exists a good partitioned tuple $M' = (S'_1, \dots, S'_n, H')$ of the same complexity as M with $H' = (h'_1, \dots, h'_m)$ such that the underlying tuple of M' is Nielsen equivalent to Y and such that the following holds. If we denote $U'_i = \langle S'_i \rangle$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ then at least one of the following occurs:

- (1) $d(X(U'_1), X(U'_2)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$;
- (2) $d(X(U'_1), h'_m X(U'_1)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$;
- (3) $d(y, h'_m y) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$ for some $y \in X$.

Recall that $k_i = L(S_i) = L(S'_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Case 1. Suppose that $d(X(U'_1), X(U'_2)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$. Choose $x_1 \in X(U'_1)$ and $x_2 \in X(U'_2)$ such that $d(x_1, x_2) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$. By part (2) of Lemma 3.3 there is $y_i \in X_{U'_i}$ such that $d(y_i, x_i) \leq D$ for $i = 1, 2$. It follows that $d(y_1, y_2) \leq 2D + \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$. Since by assumption M' is good, we can choose an S'_i -generating tree $T_{U'_i}$ for U'_i of measure at most $2D(k_i - 1) + \frac{2k_i - 1}{2k} \varepsilon$.

Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If U'_i does not fix a point then $X_{U'_i} \subset U'_i T_{U'_i}$ and there exists a $u_i \in U'_i$ such that $y_i \in u_i T_{U'_i}$. If U'_i fixes a point, then $X_{U'_i}$ is the fixed set of U'_i and hence $y_i \in X_{U'_i}$ is fixed by U'_i . In this case we can assume that in M' we have $T_{U'_i} = \{y_i\}$. This is clearly an S'_i -generating tree for U'_i of measure zero. With $u_i = 1$ we also still have $y_i \in u_i T_{U'_i}$.

Denote $S''_i := u_i S'_i u_i^{-1}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $\langle S''_i \rangle = \langle S'_i \rangle = U'_i$ and $u_i T_{U'_i}$ is the S''_i -generating tree for U'_i .

Moreover S''_i is Nielsen-equivalent to S'_i since $u_i \in U'_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Put $V := \langle U'_1, U'_2 \rangle$. Then $T_V = u_1 T_{U'_1} \cup [y_1, y_2] \cup u_2 T_{U'_2}$ is a generating tree for V with respect to $S''_1 \cup S''_2$. The measure of T_V is at most

$$2D(k_1 - 1) + \frac{2k_1 - 1}{2k} \varepsilon + 2D(k_2 - 1) + \frac{2k_2 - 1}{2k} \varepsilon + 2D + \frac{\varepsilon}{2k} =$$

$$2D(k_1 + k_2 - 1) + \frac{2(k_1 + k_2) - 1}{2k} \varepsilon.$$

Hence the partitioned tuple $M'' := (S''_1 \cup S''_2, S'_3, \dots, S'_n; H')$ is good. Since the underlying tuple of M'' is Nielsen equivalent to Y and since M'' has smaller complexity than M' and M , we obtain a contradiction to the choice of M .

Case 2. Suppose that $d(X(U'_1), h'_m X(U'_1)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$. As in (1) we see that there exist $y_1 \in X_{U'_1}$ and $y_2 \in h'_m X_{U'_1}$ such that $d(y_1, y_2) \leq 2D + \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$.

Subcase 2A. Suppose first that U'_1 does not fix a point. Again, since M' is good, after replacing S'_1 by a conjugate (in U'_1) tuple we can assume that there exists an S'_1 -generating tree $T_{U'_1}$ for U'_1 of measure at most $2D(k_1 - 1) + \frac{2k_1 - 1}{2k}\varepsilon$ such that $y_1 \in T_{U'_1}$. Clearly $(h'_m)^{-1}y_2$ lies in $X_{U'_1}$. Since $X_{U'_1} \subseteq U'_1 T_{U'_1}$ it follows that $u'_2(h'_m)^{-1}y_2 \in T_{U'_1}$ for some $u'_2 \in U'_1$.

Hence $T_V = T_{U'_1} \cup [y_1, y_2]$ is a generating tree for the subgroup $V = \langle S'_1, u'_2(h'_m)^{-1} \rangle = \langle S'_1, h'_m \rangle$ with respect to the generating set $S''_1 = S'_1 \cup \{u'_2(h'_m)^{-1}\}$.

Moreover, the measure of T_V is at most

$$2D(k_1 - 1) + \frac{2k_1 - 1}{2k}\varepsilon + 2D + \frac{\varepsilon}{2k} \leq 2D((k_1 + 1) - 1) + \frac{2(k_1 + 1) - 1}{2k}\varepsilon.$$

This implies that the tuple $M'' = (S''_1, S'_2, \dots, S'_n; H'')$ is good, where $H'' = (h'_1, \dots, h'_{m-1})$. Since M'' has smaller complexity than does M , this contradicts the choice of M .

Subcase 2B. Suppose now that U'_1 fixes a point. Then the assumption $d(X(U'_1), h'_m X(U'_1)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$ implies that there exist $y_1 \in X(U'_1)$ and $y_2 \in h'_m X(U'_1)$ such that $d(y_1, y_2) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$. Note that since U'_1 fixes a point, $X_{U'_1}$ is the fixed set of U'_1 . Denote $y'_2 = (h'_m)^{-1}y_2 \in X(U'_1)$. Let x be a point fixed by U'_1 . By Lemma 3.3 we have $d(y_1, x) \leq D$ and $d(y'_2, x) \leq D$. Put

$$K = [y'_2, x] \cup [x, y_1] \cup [y_1, y_2]$$

Then x is fixed by U'_1 and hence by S'_1 , while $h'_m y'_2 = y_2$. Thus K is an S''_1 -generating tree for the subgroup $V = \langle S'_1, h'_m \rangle$ where $S''_1 = (S'_1, h'_m)$. Note that $L(S''_1) = L(S'_1) + 1 \geq 2$ by construction. The tree K has measure at most

$$2D + \frac{\varepsilon}{2k} \leq 2D(2 - 1) + \frac{2 \cdot 2 - 1}{2k}\varepsilon$$

Again put $H'' = (h'_1, \dots, h'_{m-1})$ and $M'' = (S''_1, S'_2, \dots, S'_n; H'')$. Then M'' is good and has smaller complexity than M . This contradicts the choice of M .

Case 3. Suppose that $d(y, h'_m y) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$ for some $y \in X$. In this case we replace M' by

$$M'' = (S'_1, \dots, S'_n, S'_{n+1}; H'')$$

where $S'_{n+1} = (h'_m)$ and $H'' = (h'_1, \dots, h'_{m-1})$.

By assumption on Y we have $h'_m \neq 1$. Hence M'' is good and of smaller complexity than M , which again yields a contradiction. $\square$

Remark 3.7. Essentially the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 implies a relative version of our main result. If $U_1, \dots, U_n$ are subgroups of a group G , we will say that G is *freely indecomposable relative to* $U_1, \dots, U_n$ if there does not exist an action of G on a simplicial tree X with trivial edge stabilizers and without inversions such that each U_i fixes a vertex. Essentially the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 implies the following relative version of our main result.

Suppose G is freely indecomposable relative to $U_1, \dots, U_n$ and that G is generated by $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n \cup \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. Suppose G acts D -acylindrically on an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree in such a way that each U_i fixes a point. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a G -generating tree of measure at most $2D(n + k - 1) + \epsilon$.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.Alonso, T.Brady, D.Cooper, V.Ferlini, M.Lustig, M.Mihalik, M.Shapiro and H.Short. *Notes on hyperbolic groups*. in “Group theory from a geometrical viewpoint”, Proc. ICTP. Trieste, World Scientific, Singapore, 1991, 3–63
- [2] W. Ballmann, *Lectures on spaces of nonpositive curvature*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995, With an appendix by Misha Brin.
- [3] H. Bass, *Covering theory for graphs of groups*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **89** (1993), no. 1-2, 3–47.
- [4] N. Benakli and I. Kapovich, *Boundaries of hyperbolic groups*, “Combinatorial and Geometric Group Theory” (R.Gilman et al, editors), Contemporary Mathematics, **296**, pp. 39–93, American Mathematical Society, 2002
- [5] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn, *Bounding the complexity of simplicial group actions on trees*. Invent. Math. **103** (1991), no. 3, 449–469
- [6] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn, *A counterexample to generalized accessibility*. Arboreal group theory (Berkeley, CA, 1988), 133–141, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 19, Springer, New York, 1991
- [7] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn, *A combination theorem for negatively curved groups*, J. Differential Geom. **35** (1992), no. 1, 85–101.
- [8] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn, *Stable actions of groups on real trees*. Invent. Math. **121** (1995), no. 2, 287–321
- [9] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn, *Addendum and correction to: “A combination theorem for negatively curved groups”* [*J. Differential Geom.* **35** (1992), no. 1, 85–101; *MR 93d:53053*], J. Differential Geom. **43** (1996), no. 4, 783–788.
- [10] O. Bogopolski and R. Weidmann *On the uniqueness of factors of amalgamated products*, J. Group Theory **5** (2002), no. 2, 233–240
- [11] B. H. Bowditch, *Notes on Gromov’s hyperbolicity criterion for path-metric spaces*, in “Group theory from a geometrical viewpoint (Trieste, 1990)”, 64–167, World Sci. Publishing, 1991
- [12] B. H. Bowditch, *A topological characterisation of hyperbolic groups*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **11** (1998), no. 3, 643–667
- [13] B. H. Bowditch, *Boundaries of strongly accessible hyperbolic groups*. The Epstein birthday schrift, 51–97 (electronic), Geom. Topol. Monogr., 1, Geom. Topol. Publ., Coventry, 1998
- [14] M. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [15] J. W. Cannon, *The theory of negatively curved spaces and groups*, Ergodic theory, symbolic dynamics, and hyperbolic spaces (Trieste, 1989), Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1991, pp. 315–369.

- [16] M. Coornaert, T. Delzant, and A. Papadopoulos, *Géométrie et théorie des groupes. Les groupes hyperboliques de Gromov*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **111**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.
- [17] F. Dahmani, *Combination of Convergence Groups*, Geometry and Topology **7** (2003), 933–963
- [18] T. Delzant, *Sur l'accessibilité acylindrique des groupes de présentation finie*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **49**, No.4, 1215–1224 (1999).
- [19] T. Delzant and L. Potyagailo, *Accessibilité hiérarchique des groupes de présentation finie*, Topology **40** (2001), no. 3, 617–629
- [20] M. Dunwoody, *The accessibility of finitely presented groups*. Invent. Math. **81** (1985), no. 3, 449–457
- [21] M. Dunwoody, *An inaccessible group*. Geometric group theory, Vol. 1 (Sussex, 1991), 75–78, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 181, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993
- [22] D. B. A. Epstein, J. W. Cannon, D. F. Holt, S. V. F. Levy, M. S. Paterson, and W. P. Thurston, *Word processing in groups*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Boston, MA, 1992
- [23] R. Gitik, *On the combination theorem for negatively curved groups*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **6** (1996), no. 6, 751–760
- [24] M. Gromov, *Hyperbolic groups*, Essays in group theory, editor S.M. Gersten, Springer-Verlag, MSRI Publications 8, 1985, 75–263.
- [25] É. Ghys and P. de la Harpe (eds.), *Sur les groupes hyperboliques d'après Mikhael Gromov*, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1990, Papers from the Swiss Seminar on Hyperbolic Groups held in Bern, 1988.
- [26] I. Kapovich, *The Combination Theorem and quasiconvexity*, International Journal of Algebra and Computation, **11** (2001), no. 2, 185–216
- [27] M. Kapovich, *Hyperbolic manifolds and discrete groups*, Progress in Mathematics, **183**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2001
- [28] I. Kapovich and H. Short, *Greenberg's theorem for quasiconvex subgroups of word hyperbolic groups*, Canad. J. Math. **48** (1996), no. 6, 1224–1244.
- [29] I. Kapovich and R. Weidmann, *Nielsen Methods for groups acting on hyperbolic spaces*, Geometriae Dedicata **98** (2003), no. 1, 95–121
- [30] I. Kapovich and R. Weidmann, *Freely indecomposable groups isometrically acting on hyperbolic spaces*, Intern. J. Algebra and Comput. **14**, (2004), 115–171.
- [31] I. Kapovich and D. Wise, *The equivalence of some residual properties of word-hyperbolic groups*. J. Algebra **223** (2000), no. 2, 562–583
- [32] A. Karrass and D. Solitar, *The free product of two groups with a malnormal amalgamated subgroup*. Canad. J. Math. **23** (1971), 933–959
- [33] O. Kharlampovich and A. Myasnikov, *Hyperbolic groups and free constructions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998), no. 2, 571–613
- [34] R. C. Lyndon and P. E. Schupp, *Combinatorial group theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 89.
- [35] M. Mitra, *Height in splittings of hyperbolic groups*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci (Math. Sci) **114**, 2004, 39–54.
- [36] Z. Sela, *The isomorphism problem for hyperbolic groups. I*. Ann. of Math. (2) **141** (1995), no. 2, 217–283
- [37] Z. Sela, *Acylindrical Accessibility*, Invent. Math. **129**, 1997, 527–565.
- [38] Z. Sela, *Structure and rigidity in (Gromov) hyperbolic groups and discrete groups in rank 1 Lie groups. II*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **7** (1997), no. 3, 561–593
- [39] E. Swenson, *Quasi-convex groups of isometries of negatively curved spaces*, Topol. Appl. **110** (2001), no. 1, 119–129.
- [40] R. Weidmann *The Nielsen method for groups acting on trees*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **85** (2002), no. 1, 93–118

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 1409
WEST GREEN STREET, URBANA, IL 61801, USA

E-mail address: `kapovich@math.uiuc.edu`

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, JOHANN WOLFGANG GOETHE-UNIVERSITÄT, ROBERT MAYER-
STRASSE 6-8, 60325 FRANKFURT (MAIN), GERMANY

E-mail address: `rweidman@math.uni-frankfurt.de`